

groups to accompany those provided by the Federal Government. This partnership between the public and private sector will serve as a model for our country, by preserving a region without draining the public's pocketbook.

I am proud to join with my colleagues from the region in this bipartisan effort to preserve the Blackstone River Valley. Working together we can help to ensure that this area, which is so rich in history, will be around for future generations to experience and enjoy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BOB FRANKS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications from the Honorable BOB FRANKS, a Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey:

APRIL 5, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court of Manville, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB FRANKS,
Congressman.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 889, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 129

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILENSEN], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule responds to a national emergency in defense readiness and training. The rule makes in order for consideration the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 889, making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, and the conference report is to be considered as read.

The conference report requires a waiver of the 3-day layover rule. This rule is being waived in order to permit the House to consider this very vital measure as quickly as possible. The Secretary of Defense recommended that this bill be completed by March 31, 1995, and since we failed to do that, we are trying to move as expeditiously as possible to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an historic day in the House of Representatives. The new majority completed the final legislation outlined in our Contract With America. The new majority proved that Congress is finally led by legislators that keep their promises and live up the commitments that they make. The new majority proved that they value families ahead of Government, cutting taxes and ensuring that every dollar returned to the people that earned it comes from reduced Government spending, rather than adding to the deficit. And the new majority made the Washington establishment lash out in anger because we are doing something totally new: cutting taxes, reducing government, and cutting the deficit.

People take note of major accomplishments, Mr. Speaker. They measure Congress by high profile legislation, like the tax relief deficit reduction bill that we passed late last night. However, I believe that it is in the more mundane legislative accomplishments that we can really measure the difference in the House of Representatives between this year and past years. When I use the term "mundane," I do not mean in any way to criticize my very dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The conference report on this emergency defense supplemental appropriations bill is proof that we are making a real difference, changing the long-ingrained culture of deficit spending in Congress. For years those of us on this side of the aisle have said that we are committed to fiscal responsibility, that the Federal Government must live within its means. However, I can understand how people would want to see some results before they actually are sure that that is the case.

The Contract With America proved that we keep our promises, and this conference report begins to establish

the real record of fiscal responsibility American taxpayers have demanded.

Our \$4.7 trillion national debt is so massive it is almost incomprehensible. How did we get there? You can probably get as many reasons as there are Members of Congress. But I know that one reason is that in the past the standard operating procedure for this House, dealing with emergency spending, is to simply add to the deficit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that era has come to an end. Things have changed. The new leadership has said that we will find offsetting cuts for all supplemental spending. While the big spenders said it could not be done with a \$1.5 trillion Federal budget, it can. We are doing it here, and we will do it again with a disaster relief supplemental appropriations bill. In fact, it is now the only way for us to meet emergencies.

Make no mistake, H.R. 889 makes supplemental appropriations of a truly emergency nature. It provides \$3.04 billion in readiness funds. Those defense funds are offset with \$2.5 billion in defense rescissions, \$775 million in nondefense rescissions, and \$142 million in foreign assistance rescissions.

Two months ago some said that the House's original nondefense rescissions were going nowhere. They said the Senate would not even consider them. I would note, Mr. Speaker, that instead of failure, the House got much of what it wanted, and this bill cuts \$746 million more than it spends. In other words, we are again doing the people's business and making a down payment on balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the real changes in Congress are at least as evident when we send a bill like this to the President as when we cut taxes and cut spending to pay for it. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very fair rule and permit the House to consider this conference report. There is a critical national security need that must be met, and H.R. 889 meets it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few years this country has called on the men and women of our armed services to perform duties ranging from humanitarian assistance in Somalia to all out war in Iraq. These duties were performed superbly and with honor. There is not one of us here today who can feel anything but pride for the job our Armed Forces have done in Africa, the Middle East, the Balkans, or in the Caribbean.

I would like to commend the conferees for their work with regard to the defense side of the conference report. While the increases in defense spending are not fully offset by direct defense cuts, this bill is certainly an improvement over the bill which the House sent to conference just a few weeks ago.

The bill still relies on some nondefense cuts to offset the additional defense spending. Those offsets include cuts of \$200 million from environmental cleanup at the Department of Energy sites and \$142 million in foreign assistance, as well as major cuts in the technology reinvestment program, the defense conversion grants that have been so important to companies in areas that have experienced significant losses of defense and aerospace jobs.

We would like to raise some additional concerns with a number of other domestic rescissions in the conference report which are not needed to offset defense spending. A few examples of those cuts are \$35 million for student loans under the Pell Grant Program, \$200 million for training and employment services, and \$200 million for clean coal technology.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the conference report effectively places a hold on any endangered species listing and critical habitat designations for the remainder of the year. We believe that the authorizing committee and not the Committee on Appropriations is the proper place to address this far-reaching and very critical issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rules does not allow separate votes on any of the amendments in disagreement. The conference report contains items which the House has not had the opportunity to consider before today, and we believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is only fair that some of these issues be voted on separately.

Mr. Speaker, even though we have many reservations about the conference report, we support the rule because it is absolutely necessary that we have this bill on the President's desk as soon as possible.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge support of this very important first step toward dealing with the deficit, and at the same time dealing with emergency spending, and again I have to apologize not only to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for in any way leading one to believe that this might be a mundane measure, but also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, Mr. YOUNG, who has now joined us, and say that I believe this is extraordinarily important. I hope we can immediately report out this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1100

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 129, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 129, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, April 5, 1995, at page H4319.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 889, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was not objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring to the House what I believe to be an extraordinary—and I say to the gentleman from the Rules Committee [Mr. DREIER], nonmundane conference report to accompany H.R. 889, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense and rescinding additional budget authority.

We need to adopt the conference report so that we can respond quickly to what we all acknowledge is an emergency in funding readiness operations.

First, I want to acknowledge the valiant efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. YOUNG] and all of the members of that subcommittee, as well as all of the subcommittee chairmen who participated in the conference. They have worked diligently, along with the Members of the other body, to confect this conference agreement and have it ready today before the recess begins.

It was not an easy conference, but I think that everyone worked so hard that we ended up with an extremely

valuable product which will not only provide needed assistance and support to the young men and women in uniform in our armed services but ultimately will maintain the national security of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains \$3,041,700,000 in new budget authority for the Department of Defense. All of this budget authority is paid for, mostly from other less critical defense programs. We offset \$2,259,956,000 from the Defense Department. We provide \$442,014,000 in offsets from defense-related sources, including foreign operations, nuclear facility cleanup, and military construction activities. Also, we include burden-sharing receipts totaling \$360 million that provide additional offsets. In total, we have provided a net reduction in defense and defense-related activities of \$20,870,000.

The bill also provides other cuts totaling \$775,067,000 in nondefense budget rescissions. Taken in total, the bill provides a net budget authority reduction of \$746,067,000. Let me repeat that. This bill has a net budget authority reduction of \$746 million plus.

I will include for the RECORD a table detailing these specific reductions.

Mr. Speaker, we had a difficult conference on what I had hoped would be a not-too-difficult bill. But I would ask that the Members consider the following points as they consider this conference report:

The bill is more than offset in budget authority, as I have indicated, by nearly three-quarters of \$1 billion.

It meets Secretary of Defense Perry's needs to replenish readiness accounts depleted by humanitarian peacekeeping operations.

It also carries the emergency designation for funding that Secretary Perry has requested. And it makes a modest contribution to our readiness needs.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the appropriations mentioned, the agreement includes language requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to submit reports to the Congress each month concerning our loans and our currency agreements with Mexico.

It also requires that certifications be made by the President to the Congress on that very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence in passing this measure. We need to have this bill clear Congress before we leave for the recess to avoid a major disruption in our readiness activities. Democrats and Republicans alike have worked hard in a bipartisan, bicameral spirit to approve this conference report in time for our departure. I urge all Members to vote for this agreement.

At this point in the RECORD I would also like to insert a table reflecting the details of the conference. It is a very important conference report. Again, I urge its adoption.

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 889)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
TITLE I							
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS							
CHAPTER I							
PART I							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY							
Military Personnel							
104-4	Military Personnel, Army.....	69,300,000	69,300,000	35,400,000	280,700,000	+181,400,000	+225,300,000
104-4	Military Personnel, Navy.....	49,500,000	49,500,000	49,500,000	183,100,000	+133,600,000	+133,600,000
104-4	Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	10,400,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	25,200,000	+14,800,000	+14,800,000
104-4	Military Personnel, Air Force.....	71,700,000	71,700,000	37,400,000	207,100,000	+135,400,000	+169,700,000
	Reserve Personnel, Army.....				6,500,000	+6,500,000	+6,500,000
104-4	Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	9,800,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
	Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....				1,300,000	+1,300,000	+1,300,000
	Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....				2,800,000	+2,800,000	+2,800,000
	National Guard Personnel, Army.....				11,000,000	+11,000,000	+11,000,000
	National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....				5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
	Total, Military Personnel.....	205,500,000	205,500,000	137,300,000	712,300,000	+508,800,000	+575,000,000
Operation and Maintenance							
104-4	Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	958,600,000	958,600,000	636,900,000	936,600,000	-22,000,000	+298,700,000
104-4	Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	347,600,000	347,600,000	284,100,000	423,700,000	+78,100,000	+139,600,000
104-4	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	38,000,000	38,000,000	27,700,000	33,500,000	-4,500,000	+5,800,000
104-4	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	888,700,000	888,700,000	785,800,000	852,500,000	-36,200,000	+66,700,000
104-4	Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	43,200,000	43,200,000	43,200,000	46,200,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000
104-4	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	15,400,000	+9,000,000	+9,000,000
	Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	2,282,500,000	2,282,500,000	1,784,100,000	2,307,900,000	+25,400,000	+523,600,000
Procurement							
104-4	Other Procurement, Army.....	28,600,000	28,600,000		8,300,000	-20,300,000	+8,300,000
104-4	Other Procurement, Air Force.....	8,100,000	8,100,000			-8,100,000	
	Total, Procurement.....	38,700,000	38,700,000		8,300,000	-28,400,000	+8,300,000
Other Department of Defense Programs							
104-4	Defense health program.....	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	13,200,000	-800,000	-800,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS							
104-4	Burdensharing contribution, misc. receipts (sec. 102)..	-360,000,000	-360,000,000		-360,000,000		-360,000,000
	Total, Chapter I.....	2,178,700,000	2,178,700,000	1,835,400,000	2,681,700,000	+503,000,000	+746,300,000
CHAPTER II							
PART II							
RESCINDING CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY							
Operation and Maintenance							
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....			-16,300,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+14,300,000
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....		-15,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+13,000,000	
	(By transfer).....				(23,800,000)	(+23,500,000)	(+23,500,000)
	Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....		-18,800,000	-90,000,000	-68,800,000	-50,000,000	+21,200,000
	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....				-6,200,000	-6,200,000	-6,200,000
	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....				-15,400,000	-15,400,000	-15,400,000
	Environmental Restoration, Defense.....		-150,000,000	-300,000,000	-300,000,000	-150,000,000	
	Former Soviet Union threat reduction.....		-80,000,000		-20,000,000	+80,000,000	-20,000,000
	Total, Operation and Maintenance.....		-263,800,000	-406,300,000	-414,400,000	-150,800,000	-8,100,000
Procurement							
	Aircraft Procurement, Army, 1995.....			-77,811,000	-34,411,000	-34,411,000	+43,200,000
	Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 1993.....			-85,000,000	-85,000,000	-85,000,000	
	Procurement of Ammunition, Army 1995.....			-86,320,000	-55,900,000	-55,900,000	+33,420,000
	Other Procurement, Army, 1995.....			-46,900,000	-32,100,000	-32,100,000	+14,800,000
	Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1995.....			-26,800,000			+26,800,000
	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1993.....				-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1994.....		-15,000,000			+15,000,000	
	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1995.....		-71,400,000		-27,500,000	+43,900,000	-27,500,000
	Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1993.....		-33,000,000	-33,000,000	-33,000,000		
	Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1994.....		-86,200,000	-86,184,000	-99,000,000	-12,800,000	-12,816,000
	Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1995.....				-89,500,000	-89,500,000	-89,500,000
	Other Procurement, Air Force, 1995.....			-6,100,000	-6,100,000	-6,100,000	
	National Guard and Reserve Equipment.....		-30,000,000		-30,000,000		-30,000,000
	Procurement, Defense-Wide, 1995.....			-81,000,000	-32,000,000	-32,000,000	+49,000,000
	Defense Production Act Purchases.....		-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000		
	Total, Procurement.....		-335,600,000	-631,715,000	-724,511,000	-388,911,000	-82,786,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 889) — continued

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation						
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 1994		-26,300,000		-5,000,000	+23,300,000	-5,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 1995		-19,700,000	-38,300,000	-43,000,000	-23,300,000	-4,700,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 1994		-1,200,000			+1,200,000	
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 1995		-56,900,000	-59,600,000	-66,800,000	-9,900,000	-9,200,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 1994		-93,800,000	-81,100,000	-49,800,000	+44,200,000	+31,500,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 1995		-75,800,000	-226,900,000	-191,200,000	-115,400,000	+35,700,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, 1994		-77,000,000	-77,000,000	-77,000,000		
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, 1995		-491,600,000	-351,000,000	-436,445,000	+55,155,000	-85,445,000
Total, Research, Development, Test & Evaluation..		-848,300,000	-833,900,000	-871,045,000	-24,745,000	-37,145,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
National Security Education Trust Fund:						
Total funding available		(-161,287,000)		(-75,000,000)	(+86,287,000)	(-75,000,000)
Appropriation from trust fund currently unobligated.		-14,500,000			+14,500,000	
Total, Chapter II		-1,480,200,000	-1,873,915,000	-2,006,956,000	-548,756,000	-136,041,000
PART III						
ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
Military Personnel						
Military Personnel, Army		75,500,000			-75,500,000	
Military Personnel, Navy		68,200,000			-68,200,000	
Military Personnel, Marine Corps		3,000,000			-3,000,000	
Military Personnel, Air Force		70,400,000			-70,400,000	
Reserve Personnel, Army		6,500,000			-6,500,000	
Reserve Personnel, Navy		5,000,000			-5,000,000	
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps		1,300,000			-1,300,000	
Reserve Personnel, Air Force		2,800,000			-2,800,000	
National Guard Personnel, Army		11,000,000			-11,000,000	
National Guard Personnel, Air Force		5,000,000			-5,000,000	
Total, Military Personnel		248,700,000			-248,700,000	
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation and Maintenance, Army		133,000,000			-133,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Navy		107,000,000			-107,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps		46,000,000			-46,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force		80,400,000			-80,400,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve		13,000,000			-13,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve		18,000,000			-18,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve		1,000,000			-1,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve		2,800,000			-2,800,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard		10,000,000			-10,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard		10,000,000			-10,000,000	
Total, Operation and Maintenance		421,000,000			-421,000,000	
Total, Part III		669,700,000			-669,700,000	
CHAPTER III						
PART IV						
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
104-4 Coast Guard operations (sec. 104)	28,297,000		28,297,000	28,297,000	+28,297,000	
FFRDC'S/Consultant services (sec. 106)			-100,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-50,000,000
Military Construction (sec. 113):						
Military construction, Army, 1995				-3,500,000	-3,500,000	-3,500,000
Military construction, Navy, 1995				-3,500,000	-3,500,000	-3,500,000
Military construction, Air Force, 1995				-3,500,000	-3,500,000	-3,500,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve, 1992				-25,100,000	-25,100,000	-25,100,000
NATO, 1995				-33,000,000	-33,000,000	-33,000,000
Base realignment & closure account, Part III, 1993..				-32,000,000	-32,000,000	-32,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (by transfer) (sec. 115)				(76,900,000)	(+76,900,000)	(+76,900,000)
Sec. 8005 transfer authority			(-250,000,000)			(+250,000,000)
Expiring balances, FY 1993, Title III (sec. 117)				-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
Total, Chapter III	28,297,000		-71,703,000	-322,303,000	-322,303,000	-250,900,000
Total, Chapters I, II and III	2,206,997,000	1,388,200,000	-10,218,000	349,441,000	-1,038,756,000	+359,659,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 889) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER IV						
	PART V						
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
104-4	Debt restructuring: Debt relief for Jordan	275,000,000		275,000,000			-275,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Federal Railroad Administration						
	Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: Capital				21,500,000	+21,500,000	+21,500,000
	Total, Title I (net)	2,481,997,000	1,388,200,000	284,782,000	370,941,000	-1,017,259,000	+108,159,000
	Appropriations	(2,481,997,000)	(2,848,400,000)	(2,238,697,000)	(2,731,497,000)	(-116,903,000)	(+492,800,000)
	Rescissions		(-1,460,200,000)	(-1,973,915,000)	(-2,360,558,000)	(-900,356,000)	(-386,641,000)
	TITLE II - OTHER RESCISSIONS						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
	Immigration Emergency Fund		-70,000,000	-10,000,000	-45,000,000	+25,000,000	-35,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	National Institute of Standards and Technology						
	Industrial technology services		-107,000,000	-32,000,000	-90,000,000	+17,000,000	-58,000,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
	Operations, research and facilities			-2,500,000			+2,500,000
	National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
	Information infrastructure grants			-34,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	+19,000,000
	Economic Development Administration						
	Economic development assistance programs			-40,000,000			+40,000,000
	Total, Department of Commerce		-107,000,000	-108,500,000	-105,000,000	+2,000,000	+3,500,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Small Business Administration						
	Salaries and expenses			-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
	Legal Services Corporation						
	Payment to the Legal Services Corporation			-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
	Total, Related Agencies			-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	Administration of Foreign Affairs						
	Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad			-26,500,000			+26,500,000
	Total, Chapter I (rescissions)		-177,000,000	-177,000,000	-180,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Atomic Energy Defense Activities: Defense Environ- mental Restoration and Waste Management		-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-200,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
	CHAPTER III						
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
	MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	International Financial Institutions						
	Contribution to the International Development Association			-70,000,000	-80,000,000	-80,000,000	+10,000,000
	Contribution to the African Development Fund		-62,014,000	-62,014,000	-62,014,000		
	Total, International Financial Institutions		-62,014,000	-132,014,000	-122,014,000	-80,000,000	+10,000,000
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
	Development Assistance Fund			-13,000,000	-12,500,000	-12,500,000	+500,000
	Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States			-9,000,000			+9,000,000
	Assistance for the New Independent States of the Soviet Union		-110,000,000	-18,000,000	-7,500,000	+102,500,000	+10,500,000
	Total, Agency for International Development		-110,000,000	-40,000,000	-20,000,000	+90,000,000	+20,000,000
	Total, Chapter III (rescissions)		-172,014,000	-172,014,000	-142,014,000	+30,000,000	+30,000,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 889) — continued

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
CHAPTER IV						
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR						
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management			-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	
RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology		-200,000,000	-200,000,000	-200,000,000		
Total, Chapter IV (rescissions)		-200,000,000	-201,500,000	-201,500,000	-1,500,000	
CHAPTER V						
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
Employment and Training Administration						
Training and employment services		-200,000,000	-200,000,000	-200,000,000		
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
104-28 School improvement programs	-103,084,000	-100,000,000		-85,000,000	+ 35,000,000	-85,000,000
104-40 Student financial assistance			-100,000,000	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	+ 65,000,000
Total, Chapter V (rescissions)	-103,084,000	-300,000,000	-300,000,000	-300,000,000		
CHAPTER VI						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Federal Aviation Administration						
Facilities & equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)			-35,000,000	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	
Federal Highway Administration						
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund)			-139,948,000			+ 139,948,000
Miscellaneous highway demonstration projects (Highway Trust Fund)			-12,004,450	-12,004,000	-12,004,000	+ 450
Total, Federal Highway Administration			-151,952,450	-12,004,000	-12,004,000	+ 139,948,450
Federal Railroad Administration						
104-28 Local rail freight assistance	-13,216,371	-13,126,000		-6,563,000	+ 6,563,000	-6,563,000
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation:						
Pennsylvania station redevelopment project		-40,000,000		-40,000,000		-40,000,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	-13,216,371	-53,126,000		-46,563,000	+ 6,563,000	-46,563,000
Total, Chapter VI (rescissions)	-13,216,371	-53,126,000	-186,952,450	-93,567,000	-40,441,000	+ 93,385,450
CHAPTER VII						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
Annual contributions for assisted housing			-400,000,000			+ 400,000,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
National aeronautical facilities		-400,000,000			+ 400,000,000	
Total, Chapter VII (rescissions)		-400,000,000	-400,000,000		+ 400,000,000	+ 400,000,000
Total, Title II (rescissions)	-116,300,371	-1,402,140,000	-1,537,468,450	-1,117,081,000	+ 285,050,000	+ 420,385,450
Grand total (net)	2,365,898,829	-13,940,000	-1,272,684,450	-746,140,000	-732,200,000	+ 526,544,450
Appropriations	(2,481,897,000)	(2,848,400,000)	(2,238,867,000)	(2,731,487,000)	(-116,903,000)	(+ 482,800,000)
Rescissions	(-116,300,371)	(-2,862,340,000)	(-3,511,381,450)	(-3,477,637,000)	(-615,297,000)	(+ 33,744,450)
(Transfer out)						
(By transfer)			(-250,000,000)	(100,400,000)	(+ 100,400,000)	(+ 350,400,000)

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill originally left the House, I voted against it for a number of reasons. First of all, because it took money from domestic programs to pay for some of the additional Pentagon spending in the bill.

Second, the bill added to the deficit. At the time the bill left the House, the committee indicated that even though the outlays were not in balance, that in fact the bill was balanced in terms of budget authority. But after the bill passed the House, the committee produced a table, I did not produce that table, the committee produced a table, which indicated that in fact the bill, as it left the House, added \$186 million in budget authority to the deficit and it added \$250 million in outlay spending to the deficit in the first year and \$650 million to the deficit in the out years.

I thought that was a very important reason to object to the bill. When we went to conference with the Senate, I offered a motion to instruct conferees. And essentially at that time what I said is that I was willing to overlook, though I was not enthusiastic about the idea, I was willing to overlook the fact that some domestic-related programs were used to finance some of the Pentagon spending in the bill, provided that the bill, in fact, would be paid for. So we asked the conferees to produce a bill which was, in fact, paid for.

In conference, I did not sign the conference report for a number of reasons.

First of all, because in the nondefense portion of this bill, it retains spending for an item which was strongly insisted on in the Senate, which begins a new construction program in the area of education. I, frankly, think it is silly and shortsighted and stupid, even though that program in and of itself may be useful, for us to spend money on that program which we do not have at the very same time that we are cutting money from existing education programs.

Second, I wanted to register my objection to the fact that the committee continues to insist that we spend \$14 million in my district which I do not want to spend. I do not know of another situation in the Congress where you have both U.S. Senators and the Member of the House representing a specific district asking that a project be canceled in our district. That is what we are asking to do. Yet the Congress, in what I regard as a typical lap dog puppy situation, again rolled over and decided to give the Navy the money for its toy again.

Third, I do not like the fact that this is treated as an emergency and, therefore, does not count added defense spending in out years against the budget caps. In fact, it should, if we are serious about deficit reduction.

And fourth, I was trying to help the administration on the issue of Jordan because the administration was asking

for help in seeing to it that the Jordan debt provision, which in the Senate was originally contained in this bill, not be moved from this bill to the \$17 billion rescission bill which we have sent to the Senate.

But on that score, I would say that, in light of the administration's negotiations which they conducted last night in the Senate, without consultation on the side so far as I know, it appears to me that the White House does not mind being jerked around on the issue of Jordan. It would appear to me the White House does not mind being blackmailed on the issue of Jordan. And so if they do not care, why should I?

So what I am going to do on the floor, now that I have registered my concern on the individual points, is to support this conference report, because in essence, it does what we asked them to do in the motion to instruct, and it does what the bill did not do when it originally left the House, which is to largely offset the spending with cuts, so it does remain significantly deficit neutral.

So I think that in comparison to the House-passed package, this is much more preferable. Having registered my concerns on the details, I will, in the interest of comity and the interest of getting things done, recognize the progress that was made in the conference report and support the bill as it is reported.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Certainly I will reciprocate in the event that we run short of time, although I do not think that we will. I would just like to point out that insofar as the gentleman's objections to the educational infrastructure project are concerned, the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who chairs the subcommittee on which the gentleman is the ranking minority member, totally agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that that program is wasteful, inefficient, and almost constitutes a brand new entitlement for which the taxpayer to the U.S. Federal Government cannot possibly be expected to ultimately pay.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I say further to the gentleman that the fact is that the other body pressed very hard for this program, notwithstanding the prognosis that in future legislative activities before this body, that this program will not be looked upon kindly. Yet, it was a compromise. It was an effort to reach an accommodation, at least temporarily, so this very important bill could go forward. Unfortunately, the whole appropriation was not stricken. But I totally share the sentiment of the gentleman and want to assure him that it was only

agreed to for the purposes of comity with the other body in order to conclude the entire conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I would say that I certainly recognize the value of the program that the Senate is trying to support, but it just seems to me that the worst thing one can do in a situation of tight budgets is to unfairly raise people's expectations about the ability of the Federal Government to fund yet another program when, in fact, we are making substantial reductions in programs that now do some very good things for a lot of people who need help.

□ 1115

I share the gentleman's view on that point, and would simply observe that for all of the Members who voted for the motion to instruct, demanding that conferees come back with a bill which is essentially budget neutral and does not add to the deficit, we won our point, and I think that deserves recognition on our part on the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, in further response to the gentleman, I agree with his points. I would add, though, that the administration made a commitment to Jordan that there would be three tranches in response to the President's agreement to forgive Jordanian debt; that one would be expected to be provided in 1995, one in 1996, and one in 1997.

We are currently dealing with a conference agreement on a supplemental and a rescission of 1995 appropriations. We are going to deal with another one, another 1995 supplemental and rescission conference agreement in the coming weeks. We will deal with this relief in that agreement. The fact is that the three tranches for Jordanian aid will be dealt with in 1995, not in 1996 or 1997, for the entire total balance of the commitment that the President has made to Jordan.

If that is jerking the administration around, I think they would think it is a good way to do it, from their point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the very hard-working, diligent, and most distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to use all of the time we have allocated today. I did want to pay a special tribute to my chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], because as we proceeded with

this supplemental he was there every step of the way in strong support of what we were doing.

I have to admit, after having served in the minority for so many years, to be the chairman of the subcommittee that brought out the first appropriation bill of this new Congress was gratifying, and it was a partnership effort. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the former chairman of the subcommittee, could not have been a stronger supporter, and I think we both felt really good when the subcommittee and the full committee agreed to the recommendation we made on how to deal with this emergency supplemental. We moved it even ahead of the request from the administration, because we recognized the emergency and the time element.

I would also want to say that, in addition to the Members who were so helpful and so supportive, I never saw a staff work as many hours, attend as many meetings, draw up as many papers and make as many comparisons on so many different ideas as I saw in this particular exercise. I pay tribute to that staff, because even after we would go home at 10 or 11 o'clock at night, they were still here after we left, and they were here before we got back the next morning.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a couple of minutes to say that we are facing not just a supplemental issue today but we are facing a real concern about the readiness of our forces and the ability to defend our national interest.

For the last 10 years we have experienced a reduction, a reduction in the amount of funding made available to our national defense establishment for pay for forces, for uniforms, for training, for modernization of equipment. We have reduced that budget for the last 10 years. The budget request that we deal with this year would be the 11th reduction.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and I have discussed this on a number of occasions, we would not be able to do today what we did in Desert Storm just a few short years ago, because of the tremendous reductions. We have to face up to and recognize that the many contingencies that are not planned for, that are not funded, that we have to develop some way to deal with these contingencies.

If the President is going to deploy forces around the world on an unplanned contingency, he ought to consult with the Congress of the United States, so we can work together not only in devising the plan to handle the deployment and the mission, but to determine how we are going to pay for it before we get into a crisis situation like we face today.

If we do not pass this supplemental today, the Navy is prepared to tie up ships within the next couple of weeks. The Air Force and the Navy both are prepared to ground airplanes; not prepared to, they would be forced to, be-

cause the money for those purposes has already been spent for these contingencies.

Mr. Speaker, one other issue, Haiti. There was a strong difference of opinion in this House whether or not we should even have gone to Haiti to return Aristide to office. Nevertheless, it happened. Our troops performed almost flawlessly. We should be so extremely proud of the way that they did perform in Haiti.

However, Haiti was not a military threat to our Nation, not a security threat to our Nation, and the Department of Defense should not have to pay the bill for the Haiti operation. It should come from another account, whether it is the State Department or the foreign aid account. It should not come out of the hide of the national defense establishment that is already suffering from 10 years of funding reductions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will pay close attention, because the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which we now call the Committee on National Security, and I have met on many occasions since the beginning of this Congress. We have reached an agreement that any projects, any items that are going to be authorized in their bill or appropriated by our appropriations subcommittee had better have a national defense application.

We are not going to use the national defense budget for a slush fund for anyone. We are going to be very careful not to use the national defense funding for political projects, whatever they might be. Whatever is funded and authorized in this Congress for national defense is going to be used for national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for the stature that he displays in being willing to support this legislation today, although he opposed it in the beginning. It is somewhat different than it was in the beginning. I appreciate all the support from the gentleman from Wisconsin and his staff, all of the Members of the House and our subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the Department of Defense is facing a critical shortfall in its funding for military readiness and training—because the funds we provided last year for these activities have been siphoned off, and used to pay for the large number of contingency operations that our Armed Forces have been involved in since last fall. Haiti, Bosnia, the Middle East, refugee relief at Guantanamo Bay, Korea, Somalia. All these operations, the DOD has been forced to pay for out of hide—from funds intended for training and readiness in the second half of the current fiscal year.

The second half of the fiscal year began last Saturday, Mr. Speaker—and if we do not act to replenish the DOD's accounts, beginning next week we will start to see the Pentagon ordering cutbacks in all of the military services.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that without this supplemental, in April they will have to order the Air Force to cut flying hours by 25 percent; the Navy will have to cancel scheduled maintenance on two aircraft carriers; the Marines will have to cancel exercises and cut operating forces budgets by 20 percent; and the Army will have to cut tank training 25 percent and scrub preparations for exercises at the National Training Center in California.

That is just what will happen in April. It will get worse as the year goes on.

That is why we have to act—and why we have brought back to the House this emergency supplemental for the DOD which, while it is not perfect, provides the only way we can avoid what will be a disaster for military readiness.

This bill provides just over \$3 billion in readiness funding for the military—and it not only covers the costs of the contingency operations I just mentioned but also provides money to fully finance the military pay raise for 1995, as well as a \$250 million shortfall in pay accounts for our forces stationed overseas, brought on by the drop of the dollar.

And at the same time we provide this emergency funding, we have more than fully offset these costs—by recommending over \$3.8 billion worth of rescissions and offsets. As a result, even with the funding for the DOD, this bill will reduce current budget authority by over \$740 million dollars.

Now, I have to admit I am not entirely comfortable with having to totally offset an emergency supplemental for our military. Our committee has never done this before; and we have to realize that depending on the type of military actions our forces may have to carry out, it may be impossible to totally offset Defense supplementals in the future. But in this bill we have done so.

I must also admit that I am not entirely pleased with how we finally offset this bill. After a long and hard negotiation with the other body, we ended up agreeing to taking nearly \$2.4 billion in rescissions out of other Defense accounts—\$2.26 billion from programs under the National Security subcommittee, and another \$100 million from military construction. On top of this, \$200 million is coming from the defense-related accounts in the Department of Energy.

In conference, we were basically asked to rob Peter to pay Paul—take money out of other Defense accounts to pay for Defense readiness. We did our best to recommend Defense offsets which were less critical, less important—but the fact remains, the Defense budget has been cut for 10 straight years. There are no easy cuts left. And we had a very difficult time settling with the Senate which Defense accounts were important, and which ones were not.

None of this was easy for the House conferees—but we were left with no choice. And I want to thank Chairman VUCANOVICH and Chairman MYERS for helping with offsets, because without these we could not have gotten an agreement before the recess.

We would not be in this situation if the President would have come to the Congress and asked for approval of these operations as well as the needed money in advance. With the exception of the deployments to the Middle East and Korea, we are not talking about emergency military operations here. We are

talking about peacekeeping, and humanitarian operations—things that are not the core mission of the Department of Defense.

That is one thing we were all able to agree upon in our conference—that the President just cannot keep ordering these operations and then expect us to come up with the money afterwards. We just can not keep doing this. We will destroy military readiness and other critical defense programs. We lay all this out in the statement of managers. And I know, based on how all of us in the conference felt—Chairman LIVINGSTON, Senators HATFIELD, BYRD, STEVENS, and INOUE; and certainly myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA—that if the President does not do something to correct this then we will come back in the 1996 appropriations bills with some further recommendations of our own.

So, this is not a perfect agreement, but it is one that we have to pass. And I want to thank BOB LIVINGSTON and the ranking member of our subcommittee, JACK MURTHA, as well as our Senate counterparts for their efforts to bring this emergency bill back to the House before we leave this week. This is a good bill, and one that is absolutely essential. I urge your support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to make one additional point on the Jordan issue, in light of the comments made by the chairman. Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker: I can recall when a previous President, President Bush, asked for bipartisan help to see to it that they could in fact move events forward in the Middle East by withholding funds for the Israel loan guarantee.

That was not a popular position for President Bush to take in the Congress. At that time I supported President Bush strongly, because I thought that unless those loan guarantees were held up, we would never see a posture on the part of the Israeli Government with respect to the settlements issue that was consistent with American foreign policy.

I would compare that bipartisan support of President Bush with the quite different approach taken by the other body, and especially the majority party in the other body on the issue of Jordan. We now have this President asking for help to again move the peace process forward by funding the commitment that the President made to Jordan when they agreed to follow along in this round on the peace process. But instead, what has happened is that we have had an insistence from the majority leader in the other body that funding for Jordan be taken out of this bill, where it belongs, and put into what is essentially a domestic rescission bill.

What that will mean is that any Member who votes for that rescission bill will be asked to make cuts in domestic programs for kids and for seniors in order to fund debt relief for Jordan. I do not think that is a very smart thing to do tactically. I do not think that is the right thing to do substantively. It seems to me if we are

going to provide that action for Jordan, that it belongs in this bill and it should be offset in this bill, because I am tired of seeing this Government make foreign policy decisions that wind up having domestic consequences that are negative for our constituents.

Another example would be, for instance, the situation which we find ourselves in with respect to refugees, where the Federal Government will make agreements allowing refugees into this country, and then they will walk away from the obligation to support the financing of those refugees, and turn the obligation for that over to State and local governments.

I do not think that is legitimate. I think foreign policy issues should be dealt with in foreign policy bills. That is why Jordan belongs in this bill. That is why Jordan belongs in this bill, not the other bill.

However, I find it quaint that the administration asked a bipartisan group of people to go up to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue twice on last Thursday to talk about the necessity to keep Jordan funding in this bill, rather than moving it over to the other bill, and then we find out that without any notice whatsoever to anybody on this side of the Capitol, the administration decides, after all, they are going to acquiesce in putting it in the other bill.

That is why I say that the administration apparently does not mind being jerked around. I do. It seems to me the next time the administration asks someone in the Congress to defend their position on a foreign policy issue in the Congress, it would be nice to know that we could find the administration where they were the last time we talked to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will let the gentleman's comments stand where they are, and I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak regarding the conference agreement on Senate amendment numbered 5, the Military Construction Subcommittee's portion of the bill H.R. 889, as well as action to date on the bill H.R. 1158.

As these two bills proceeded through the House, no rescissions were proposed for military construction.

The Senate took an opposing view. On H.R. 889, the Senate imposed a contingent rescission based on the current round of base closure, and this contingent rescission may have reached a total of \$150 million. On H.R. 1158, the Senate imposed additional rescissions totaling \$230.8 million. In the House

view, these rescissions were ill-advised and unnecessary at this time.

In conference action on H.R. 889, the House very reluctantly agreed to rescissions totaling \$100.6 million, and these specific rescissions are explained in detail in the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report. More importantly, the conferees agreed that all rescissions proposed by the Senate in both bills would be addressed in the conference agreement on the bill H.R. 889. Therefore, no rescissions will be recommended for military construction in final action on H.R. 1158.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the Members' attention a title that is a part of this Defense supplemental bill, title IV, entitled "The Mexican Debt Disclosure Act of 1995," a measure that was attached in the Senate and then agreed to by the conferees.

Let me mention also, Mr. Speaker, that as the ranking member on our side has indicated, it has been very difficult to get the \$3.1 billion identified in the overall defense supplemental bill to take care of costs for Haiti, for Bosnia, for Somalia. I might mention \$3.1 billion.

Title IV, which deals with Mexico, talks about \$20 billion. Of course, that is money that has not been voted on by the Members of this body, because we have not been permitted a vote by our own leadership. We have been thwarted at every turn.

Now we are faced with a vote on a defense supplemental that has a title that pushes us a little bit further toward getting some additional information from the Clinton administration. I have to say that it is a step in the right direction, but it is certainly not what we have been asking for in this body.

□ 1130

A little recent history here. Members will remember that we were ruled against, those of us who wanted a clean vote on the question of whether we should be appropriating dollars to support the bailout in Mexico. The Speaker ruled against us. We were not allowed an open debate a few weeks ago. Then there was a vote in the Republican conference about a week ago, 2 to 1 against getting a vote here, a clean vote on the floor on the question of these credits and loan guarantees being extended to Mexico. Now the only item we were able to get passed was a resolution that had broad bipartisan support here, House Resolution 80, which we had to use a special procedure to disgorge it from committee and it essentially only asked the administration for information which was supposed to be here by March 15 and which is not here. Only parts of it are here.

Now the cleanest measure that we could get on this floor is not this title

IV of this bill but rather Discharge Petition 2 which sits at the desk there that would allow us a clean vote on the issue of how many dollars if any should be extended further to Mexico to help bail out that tragic situation down there.

I want to point out to the Members, this title does exist in this bill. It is a serious title. Essentially what it says is that no money, loan credit guarantee or arrangement through the Exchange Stabilization Fund at the Treasury or the Federal Reserve can be extended unless the President of the United States has provided us with every single document that we have asked for in our resolution of inquiry.

I can say based on the research we have done in our office, again this information was to have been here by March 15. There are big holes in what the administration has failed to tell us, including the conditions that were placed on the bailout by members of the investment community, the relationships to the Bank for International Settlement and the other international funds involved in this bailout, and private phone conversation notes between the Government of the United States and Mexico.

I just have to say that this is another weak attempt to try to get some vote here in the Congress on a massive amount of money that is being extended by the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is not comfortable to be a Member of this body and not be allowed a full debate on a matter that is 7 times as large as the base dollar funding in this defense supplemental. This has been an insiders' deal from the beginning. I think that the Members should read the language of title IV carefully. We have a right to debate this amount of money going to another country. We are tied in knots over \$3.1 billion of money that needs to be paid to restore the amount in our readiness accounts. Why is it so difficult to get a full debate in the Congress of the United States when we have a new form of back-door foreign assistance that has been allowed to Mexico setting an incredible precedent that we will have to account for later?

I just have to say that this amendment that was added to this bill gets us to maybe second base but it does not get us the full and open debate and the kind of oversight that we need in this body on the amount of money that is now being extended to not just back up the Government of Mexico but the Mexican banking system. This is extremely serious. Title IV, an important step perhaps, gets us to second base, not the home run that we really need in order to gain proper oversight over this massive expenditure of our tax dollars.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentlewoman and say that had it not been for the Appropriations Committee, the gentlewoman would not have

an opportunity to discuss this issue at all. We have developed a compromise with the Senate on this bill. We have compelled the White House to provide documentation which has not been forthcoming to date despite a resolution passed by this House on March 1. We are doing our best to get to the bottom of the issue and try to provide as much light on the decision process on the issue of providing aid to Mexico as we possibly can. This is a good first step. There may be others. The gentlewoman should in fact be pleased that we have gone as far as we have.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for three questions?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. To the extent I have any more time on the minute, I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just ask the gentleman, is it the gentleman's understanding that in title IV that if passed it certifies that the President—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether if we vote for this, we assure ourselves that until the President certifies that without exception every requested document has been turned over to Congress, all further Mexican bailout funds through the ESF, the Federal Reserve Board or any other fund with which the United States is associated in the pipeline are halted.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield, I would say that certainly the White House counsel is going to be examining this provision carefully, but it is the gentleman's understanding that from the point of passage of the bill that the White House, or that the administration has 10 days to sign the bill. If in fact they have not provided the documentation at the end of the 10 days, there will be a period of time during which there shall be no Mexican assistance. However, if the documentation is provided prior to that time, then there is no lapse at all.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think the gentleman the chairman is correct with one possible exception. I want to make sure this is well understood. After the President signs the bill, the time starts. Then the requirement starts. Not after we pass it here in the House. It is after the President signs it, I believe, which could be as late as the 24th or 25th of this month.

Ms. KAPTUR. This leads to my second question. Then it is my understanding that under the legislation the President would not have to provide the documentation until the last day of the first month after which this legis-

lation is passed, which would mean the end of May; is that correct?

During which time billions more could flow out of that fund. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield to me, that is not my understanding. I think that the time limits are much shorter than that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Regarding the certification, it said the funds stop unless and until the President submits the appropriate documents. Until we get the certification, the money is cut off, so it would be around the 24th or 25th of this month.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply suggest that I do not think it is particularly constructive for individual Members of Congress to try to write a record of legislative intent when in fact the record that is being written is probably not accurate nor legitimate.

I do not believe, for instance, that any Member of the House who is not a member of the conference can really assure the House about anything with respect to what that language means. I certainly do not necessarily subscribe to the interpretation of the gentleman from Indiana since he was not a member of the conference and cannot possibly have an understanding of what the agreement was that was reached by persons who were in the room.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would be kind enough to yield, I would just like to read into the RECORD the actual language in title IV which says that the reports will be provided beginning on the last day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment, which would be the end of May.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the last speakers, that many of us on this side of the aisle agree that when he talked about Jordan, King Hussein, we all witnessed the King up here with good intentions, but he, in fact, does not have control of Jordan and with the Palestinians, this Member personally feels that we are dumping money down a rat hole.

I think we have also taken a look and many Members on this side of the aisle want an up-or-down vote on Mexico, the bailout. I think that it is going to be a problem. I do not know what the deal is with the support of President Clinton on the issue, but many of us would like to halt the money going to Mexico, because I think again it is money going down a rat hole.

I also agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that when we are

looking at a balanced budget and we are sending money to Mexico, we are sending money to Jordan and we have domestic problems here in this country and we also have military readiness problems, that we have got to change our modus operandi on both sides of the aisle and the administration as well.

But why is this particular issue that we are talking about today important? Military readiness, and I quote from testimony in the Committee on National Security, that we are near buffet condition when it comes to national security, and near buffet is the condition in which an airplane goes into an out-of-control spin. That condition has been created much because of the operations of this body. Our op tempo today, operation tempo, is higher than it was during Desert Storm or Vietnam. But yet our military has had dollars cut out of it not only in a \$177 billion defense cut but from not funding BRAC, from all the operations that were in Somalia, Haiti, and so on.

In Somalia, we testified, when there was an extension of Somalia that it was going to cost billions of dollars, and that was going to come out of military readiness, time and training.

This is an attempt to get a little portion of that money back. In the meantime, we have gone a year and a half without allotting the training in the military. I just got through with a briefing of the military. Our F-18's, C-10's, our F-15's, our AWACS in Bosnia and these other expenditures are killing the flight time left on those airframes. At the same time, we have air wings back in the States that are not flying. Top Gun did not fly against its class because it did not have enough fuel or parts because of the Somalia, the Haiti, the Bosnia expeditions. This is critical.

If we take a look at the extension of Somalia, we said it was going to cost billions of dollars. Then if we take a look at the retreat from Somalia that we just went through, General Aideed is still there, and it cost us over 100 Rangers that were killed in Somalia at great cost to this country. When we talk about domestic programs, when we talk about military readiness, it was not Members on this side of the aisle that made the decision to extend Somalia that cost lives and billions of dollars.

Haiti is another case. We put into position a madman in Haiti. I ask the Speaker, if we pulled out of Haiti today, what would be the condition? Do Members remember Papa Doc and Baby Doc? It would be a total turmoil there. That has cost us billions of dollars. We are paying for those military forces, military, the United States is. That is wrong, against our own military defense. Again, when we pull out of there, it is going to go back just like it has, and we could have left it there for another 100 years and it would not have been a national security.

The President is saying, what a great victory. Pull out of there and see what kind of victory we have.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a look at the different costs. There are many on the other side of the aisle that would depreciate our readiness and our capability in national defense and our military. But we are asking our men and women to put their lives on the line. Readiness is not just machines. Readiness is not just going out and turning and burning in a jet or in the ground on a tank. It is the families that are involved. We ask these high up-tempo operations at a cost of family separation, and the No. 1 indicator of our men and women leaving the service is family separation. That is part of readiness as well. We need to get a grip on this.

I ask Members on both sides of the aisle to support this supplemental, because if we do not get it, and I quote, our military will shut down at the end of this fiscal year.

□ 1145

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say that the gentlewoman who has worked so hard on the Mexican issue is to be commended, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], subcommittee chairman, should be commended, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for putting language in here that at least gives the Congress an opportunity to get information on the Mexican bailout.

But as the gentlewoman from Ohio said, we still are not going to have a vote on the ultimate \$52 billion that is going to go to Mexico, \$52,000 million that is going to Mexico without a vote by the people's House on their tax dollars.

So far it was reported in the Los Angeles Times yesterday that of the first \$5 billion, \$5,000 million, that was sent to Mexico, \$4 billion, \$4,000 million, was used to pay off American insurance companies, mutual fund investors, Wall Street brokerage houses, Mexican banks, and the richest of Mexico's rich, these people that bought their tesobonos, their bonds, down there, and that is not what we were sending the money down there for in the first place.

It is really a tragedy our tax dollars are being used to pay off these people who invested in Mexico knowing the risks. We are bailing out the big investors who took the risks, and now they are being repaid even though they should have taken the loss like anybody else that invests in financial instruments.

Now, this legislation does head in the right direction. It is a step in the right direction. The President is going to have to certify to the Congress what this money is being spent for, where it is going. They do not particularly like that at the White House, but, nevertheless, they are going to have to do it, otherwise additional tranches of money are not going to go to Mexico.

That still begs the issue. Should we be sending this money down there in the first place? Anyone who is following the financial markets knows the dollar has been dropping like a rock. It is at the lowest levels against the Japanese yen in decades, and in large part, if you talk to many economists, you will find that is due to the Mexican bailout that has been taking place unilaterally by the executive branch of Government.

This Congress was going to vote on it. We had a proposal that would protect the American taxpayer. We could not get Mexico to go along with the provisions. We could not get the White House to go along with the provisions. They decided to use the Exchange Stabilization Fund, which has never been used for that purpose before to my knowledge. There are some people that question the legality of it.

As a result, the peso has continued to drop. It finally stabilized at half of what it was worth. The dollar continues to drop.

We are responsible for the taxpayers' dollar. Even though the Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for at least putting this language in the legislation, it does not go far enough. We ultimately need an up-or-down vote on whether we should continue to send billions of United States taxpayers' dollars, billions of United States taxpayers' dollars to Mexico without any guarantees it is going to be repaid. That money right now is going down a rat hole.

Of the first \$12 billion that has gone down there, \$11 billion of it is gone. They have only increased their reserves by \$1 billion. We still need an up-or-down vote on this entire issue.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, who did an outstanding job in the conference.

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I am pleased to report that we have participated in the effort to offset the defense spending in this bill by reducing foreign aid spending by \$142 million. In addition, we have reallocated \$15 million from the Russian Officer Housing

Program, a program I have strongly opposed, to other economic assistance in the New Independent States. However, these funds would not be available to Russia.

These reductions are a downpayment on the cuts that will be necessary in fiscal year 1996. In addition, we will be looking at further reductions in the second rescission bill that is currently pending in the Senate.

In addition, while we have not provided debt relief for Jordan in this conference agreement, we have pledged to address this issue in the second rescission bill as well. We committed ourselves to meeting the parameters of the agreement between the administration and Jordan in support of the October 1994 peace agreement. The President believes this debt relief is in the national security interest of the United States, and we will make every effort to provide the full amount for debt relief in the next rescission bill.

I would just like to say a few words about the agreement on Mexican debt relief. The agreement we have reached with the Senate requires the President to provide the information on the Mexican debt crisis called for in House Resolution 80. This resolution passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 407 to 21. If you voted for that resolution, you should support this agreement.

The bill language does not cut off aid to Mexico. It does, however, require the President to provide the information requested in House Resolution 80, prior to the extension of additional aid to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this conference agreement to provide needed additional funds for our national security, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed with the gentleman's remarks.

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this is an outstanding compromise with the other body.

It meets the emergency needs of our young people in uniform in the armed services. It requires documentation from the White House on the Mexican affair, and it is a good bill.

I urge adoption of H.R. 889.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference agreement on H.R. 889, the defense supplemental bill. However, I do so with strong reservations. The conference agreement rescinds a net total of \$746 million in fiscal year 1995 and prior years appropriations in order to fund emergency defense and Coast Guard needs and to make additional offsetting reductions.

Mr. Speaker, I support the emergency supplemental appropriations that are required to restore funds spent by the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard in unanticipated peacekeeping operations. In particular, the conference agreement provides the \$28.3 million requested by the President to reimburse

the Coast Guard for operating expenses associated with extraordinary Caribbean regional activities. I am concerned that the conference committee did not fully fund the supplemental request for the operation and maintenance accounts, the backbone of our Armed Forces.

I also have strong reservations about the \$223 million rescission included in the DOD-related section of this bill for the Technology Reinvestment Program [(TRP)]. A program such as the TRP is very important to our national security interests. I, and others, feel that the TRP is vitally necessary to our country's future as we position ourselves strategically in the post-Cold War era. The President, Secretary of Defense Perry, Office of Management and Budget Director Rivlin and Fortune 500 corporations oppose the rescission of these funds, which would ensure that commercial firms in this country supply the superior technologies needed to maintain our military advantage.

In addition, I do not support the \$775 million rescinded in the bill for important domestic programs. Mr. Speaker, in particular, I take exception to the rescissions of \$200 million slated for cutting critical employment and training programs for our Nation's youth, and \$100 million to be taken out of programs for our Nation's school children and college students. I am also concerned about the rescission of \$6.6 million from the Local Rail Freight Assistance [LRFA] Program, which has a major, beneficial impact on the economy of smaller communities, small businesses and job creation.

In summary, I believe the result of the conference agreement on H.R. 889, while flawed, should be passed so that military readiness is not impaired. I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 343, nays 80, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—343

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer

Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo

Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gardner
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson

Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Rose
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy

Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Siskisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—80

Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coburn

Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyle
DeFazio
Dellums

Dixon
Duncan
Ehlers
Evans
Fattah
Fields (LA)

Filner	Luther	Schumer
Foglietta	McDermott	Serrano
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Stark
Franks (NJ)	Mineta	Stokes
Furse	Minge	Studds
Graham	Mink	Thompson
Green	Moakley	Torres
Gutierrez	Nadler	Towns
Gutknecht	Owens	Tucker
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Upton
Hilliard	Pastor	Velazquez
Hoekstra	Payne (NJ)	Vento
Holden	Pelosi	Waters
Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)	Watt (NC)
Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Williams
Johnston	Ramstad	Wise
Klug	Rangel	Woolsey
Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
Lincoln	Rush	Wynn
Lipinski	Sanders	Yates
Lofgren	Schroeder	

NOT VOTING—11

Burton	Hinchey	Reynolds
Chapman	Kasich	Scarborough
Dickey	McIntosh	Waxman
Frost	Moran	

□ 1213

Mr. WYNN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Messrs. COYNE, WISE, MOAKLEY, THOMPSON, and FIELDS of Louisiana changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mrs. THURMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the RECORD reflect, immediately after rollcall vote No. 296 on H.R. 889, that I would have voted "aye" had I been here. I was across the hall.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to have the RECORD reflect that I missed the vote, and had I been here, I would have supported the approval of the conference report on defense supplemental.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 5, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	21	72
Modified Closed ³	49	47	8	28
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	29	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 660, HOUSING FOR OLDER PERSONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 126 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 126

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 660) to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 126 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 660, the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 authored by our distinguished colleague from Florida, [Mr. SHAW].

The purpose of this legislation is to clarify the requirements for seniors-only housing by removing the "significant facilities and services" requirement for housing for older persons from the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. 3601-3631. The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination against families with children, and as the father of two young boys, I am a strong supporter of the rights of families with children of any age. However, current law also allows for seniors-only housing if it meets certain requirements, including the provision of "significant facilities and services." It is my understanding that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has devised to meet this requirement are often vague and sometimes very expensive to meet.

Mr. Speaker, I would defer to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] and to others, other members of the Committee on the Judiciary and Members who have worked diligently on this legislation, which of course the Committee on the Judiciary reported this bill, to speak to the details, to the bill's merits.

I will speak to the rule with which the Committee on Rules brings this bill to the floor. It is, I believe, an extremely fair rule; it is an open rule. Two amendments were offered by members of the minority in the Committee on the Judiciary, amendments that failed on recorded vote, and there may be other Members of Congress and not on the Committee on the Judiciary that may wish to amend this bill. Under this open rule any Member of Congress, regardless of committee or party affiliation, has the opportunity to offer any germane amendment.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 126, I believe, is exemplary, it is a totally fair, completely open rule, and I urge its adoption.